

Functions of Costume

—服飾의 機能—

梨花女子大學校 家政大學 衣類織物學科
助 教 授 金 鎮 玖

*Dept. of Textiles and Clothing
College of Home Economics
Ewha Woman's University*

Assistant Professor, Jin-Goo Kim

<CONTENTS>

Introduction	Conclusions
Background for Understanding Functions	References
Definition and Classification	

<要 約>

本 研究의 目的은 社會科學 分野의 한 概念인 “機能”을 服飾의 研究와 또한 그에 關聯 있는 分野의 研究에 應用할 수 있도록 服飾의 機能에 對한 概念的인 定義를 展開하고 服飾의 分析을 容易하게 하기 爲하여 服飾의 機能을 分類하여 體系化 하는데 있다.

비록 어떤 研究에 있어서 變因들을 分類하기 爲하여 쓰인 特殊用語나 혹은 그것들의 定義自體는 重要하지 않을지는 모르나 研究에서 特殊用語나 概念的인 用語의 定義는 研究의 資料를 處理하는데 必需的인 것이며 讀者에게 提示될 수 있는 結論을 내리고 그것을 要約 하는데 도움이 되는 것이다.

服飾의 機能을 分析하고 定義를 내리는 方法을 決定함에 있어 本研究者는 社會科學者들의 研究에서 얻어진 概念을 應用하였다.

服飾의 機能이란 어떻게 全體로서의 服飾이나 혹은 服飾의 部分들이 人間이 社會組織속에 參與 할 때에 人間을 돕는가를 意味한다.

服飾의 機能을 크게 나누어 (1) 自然環境으로 부터의 保護手段으로서 人間을 돕고 (2) 社會組織 속에서 社會의 地位나 個性의 傳達手段으로서 人間을 돕고 만족시키는 것으로 體系化 하였다.

비록 自然環境으로 부터 個體의 生理的 組織을 保護하는 手段으로서의 服飾의 機能이 있지만 이것 이 恒常 主된 機能은 아닐지도 모른다. 오히려 社會의 地位나 個性에 對한 message나 idea를 傳達하는 것이 身體保護의 機能보다 더 重要的 機能일 수도 있다. 그러므로 本研究의 표 I에 보이는 分類法을 服飾分析의 研究에 變因들로 쓸 境遇는 研究 對象地나 研究 對象者들의 背景에 따라 또는 時代 혹은 時期에 따라 어떤 變因들은 삭제 될 수도 있을 것이다.

Introduction

The purpose of this study is to develop

conceptual definitions for functions of costume and categorize them for their application to the study of costume and to facilitate analysis of costume.

Althout specific terms used to categorize variables and their difinitions in the study may not be important in themselves, they are required for management of data; that is, as aids in summerizing it and drawing conclusions that can be presented to readers.

Definitions of functions of costume or explanations of the terms and their applications to the analysis of costume are included in the sections that follow.

Background for Understanding Functions

Determining how to analyze the functions of costume demands consideration of issues surrounding the functional approach to the study of social and cultural phenomena as they have been dealt with by both antropologists and others social scientists. Two well known protagonists of functionalism with in the British school of social anthropologists were Malinowski and Radcilffe-Brown. The two men approached the study of culture some what differently. On the one hand, Malinowski stressed that culture functioned to meet both the biological needs of people, and that their psychological needs develop as they exist within socio-cultural settings.

On the other hand, Radcliffe-Brown emphasized society in his inquiries concerned with culture. For him culture consisted of standardized modes of human behavior that help maintain the social system.

Radcliffe-Brown derived his conceptual perspectives from ideas of Durkheim and other early sociologists who held that, if societies are systems, they must consist of interrelated

parts and that these parts must in turn be related not only to one another, but also to the whole society of which they are parts. Since he also viewed societees as analogus to biological organisms, he sought laws to explain how they functioned and how they were maintained. Moreover, Radcliffe-Brown thought of society as having some kind of real existence over and above the aggregate of human beings it includes. He maintained that the ultimate aim for any society is its continued survival and that its survival can only be achieved through the maintenance of social solidarity or cohesion among its members. Therefore, social solidarity is the end to which social institutions contribute more or less effectively and this contribution to social solidarity is their social function. His emphasis thus lay with the need for maintenance of society, and he was interested in how individuals' interaction leads to maintenance of the social system, rather than in their needs.

By contract, Malinowski held a biogenetic perspective of culture. He thought that human society and culture are best understood as an assamblage of institutions for satisfying basic biological, psychological, and social needs of the human organisms who make up a society. He theorized that the basic human needs of people call forth universal cultural responses, which become organized into institutions designed to satisfy these needs. A single institution can satisfy several needs, or a single need can be partly met by several institutions.¹⁾

Ralph Linton,²⁾ an American anthropogist, saw culture as the sum total of a society's

1) Bronislaw Malinowski, *A Scientific Theory of Culture and Others Essavs by Bronislaw Malinowski* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1944).

2) Ralph Linton, *The Study of Man* (New York: A. Appleton-Century Company, 1936), pp. 394-421.

patterned responses to its needs. He did not emphasize biological needs although he considered them within a broad spectrum of biological, psychological, and social needs of human beings, and he analyzed the functions of clothing complexes in terms of these needs. In his concern with cultural elements, he attempted to explain the structure of the socio-cultural system by classifying cultural elements as items, traits, trait complexes, and activities. Individual acts and objects, which constitute the overt expression of a culture, are traits, and any one of these traits can be analyzed into a number of still smaller units called items. Every trait is intimately associated with some other trait or traits to form a larger functional unit commonly known as a trait complex. When a number of trait complexes are combined, they form a still larger functional unit called activity. Thus a number of items in combination constitute a trait: a number of traits; a trait complex; a number of trait complexes an activity³⁾. Ultimately he defined the function of any particular element of culture as the contribution which it makes toward the satisfaction of a particular need or needs⁴⁾.

The author feels that the approaches to functionalism of Malinowski, Radcliffe-Brown, and Linton all contribute to understanding of functions of costume, but each has shortcomings in direct application. The varied behavior of human beings is not quite so directly traceable to biological and psychological needs of the individual as Malinowski implies; for social interactions, environmental settings, and historical accidents also mold behavior.

A society is not as real a thing as Radcliffe-Brown suggests; a society is a concept, an abstraction from people's observed behavior; and it exists only in the minds of the people who are concerned with it, whether as members of the society or as investigators of it⁵⁾. However, when we used the term "society" we must remember that we are not just referring to a human collectivity; but to a complex of institutionalized interpersonal relationships which bind people together.⁶⁾ Linton, in his concern with structure tends to overlook dynamic aspects of culture. The author has nonetheless utilized ideas drawn from the approaches of the functional theorists in deciding how to define and analyze functions of costume.

Definition and System of Classification

A general proposition that guides the analysis of functions is that functions of costume refer to how total costumes, or their parts, serve human beings as they participate in social systems. A simple system of classification functions of costume is shown in Table 1.

Although costume serves as protection of the individual as a biological organism within the physical environment, protection may not always be a primary function. Instead, conveying an idea or message about social position or identity may sometimes be more important than protection. Therefore, communication within social systems must be one of the important functions that costume serves to fulfill individual needs, inborn or learned, and

3) *Ibid.*, p. 397.

4) *Ibid.*, p. 412.

5) John Beattie, *Other Cultures* (New York: The Free Press, 1968), p. 56.

6) *Ibid.*

to support maintenance of the socio-cultural system.

Table 1. Classification of Functions of Costume

Means of Protection From
Physical Environment
Climate: cold and heat, rain, wind, and sun
Human enemies
Animal foes: insects, beasts
Accidents: machine, poison, harm, germ, fire, dirt, irritation, skin rash
Pressure and weight
Social Environment
Supernatural forces: spirits, evils
Moral danger
Means of Communication of
Social Positions and Identities: s.g.,
Social class and rank
Sex and age
Marital Status
Economic status
Occupation
Aesthetic orientation
Ceremonial status
Religions beliefs
Activity and occasions
Education
Group
Value
Personality
Taste
Customs and habits
Ideology
Interest
Mood

Conclusions

In this study a conceptual definition of functions of costume and a system of classification of functions of costume were developed for their application to the study of costume and to facilitate analysis of costume.

When the system of classification of functions of costume presented in this study is used, discussions on some variables may be minimal or some variables may be left off depending upon certain characteristics of the groups studied.

REFERENCES

- Goodenough, Ward H. *Description and Comparison in Cultural Anthropology*. Chicago: Adline Publishing Company, 1968.
- Koreber, A.L. *Anthropology: Culture Patterns and Processes*. New York and Burlingame: A Harbinger Books Edition, 1963.
- Malinowski, Bronislaw, "Culture," *Encyclopedia of Social Sciences*. Vol. II.
- Radcliffe-Brown, A.R. *The Andaman Islanders*. New York: The Free Press of Glencore, 1964.
- _____. *Structure and Functions in Primitive Society*. New York: Free Press, 1952.
- Tax, Sol, ed. *Anthropology Today: Selections*. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 1962.
- Winger, Paul Stover. *Primitive Art*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1962.